



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

AKA

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/740,800	03/09/2001	Hatem Trabelsi	T2147-906762	6158

7590 07/02/2004

Miles & Stockbridge P. C.
Suite 500
1751 Pinnacle Drive
McLean, VA 22102-3833

EXAMINER

DALENCOURT, YVES

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2157

DATE MAILED: 07/02/2004

13

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/740,800

Applicant(s)

TRABELSI, HATEM

Examiner

Yves Dalencourt

Art Unit

2157

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 December 2000 and 09 March 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 11-34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 11-34 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 09 March 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>8</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

This office action is responsive to communication filed on 12/21/2000 and the supplemental preliminary amendment filed on 03/09/2001.

Specification

Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

Therefore, " The present invention " (page 8, line 1) is redundant. It is suggested to start the abstract with --- A method, device, and software module for controlling ----.

Also, the numbers and parenthesis need to be deleted in the abstract.

Claim Objections

Claims 27 and 28 are objected to because of the following informalities: It is suggested to delete " a first-level " (claim 27, line 2) and " a second-level "(claim 28, line 2) and insert -- the first level – and -- the second-level –. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 11 – 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Brown et al (US 5,941,947; hereinafter Brown).

Regarding claim 11 and 29, Brown teaches a method for controlling access to a requestor to resources in a distributed computer system (fig. 1) comprising defining conditions for obtaining a right to a resource, assigning to the requestor at least one role based on an access control list, defining a part of a set of resources that is accessible by a given role by a validity domain, and utilizing the validity domain of the given role to restrict the resources accessible for the given role to only part of the resources (col. 1, lines 27 – 56; col. 2, lines 46 – 57; paragraph bridging col. 15, line 38 through col. 16, line 67; see abstract). Claim 29 adds the limitation of a software module for controlling access by a requestor to resources (col. 6, lines 18 – 31; col. 31, lines 30 - 42).

Regarding claims 12 – 13 and 30 - 31, Brown teaches a method for controlling access to a requestor to resources in a distributed computer system (fig. 2A), which further stores an additional piece of information relative to the need to consult the validity domain of the role in the access control list; further comprising consulting the

additional information relative to the need to consult the validity domain of the role and verifying that the resource in question belongs to the validity only if required by said information (col. 4, lines 15 – 65).

Regarding claims 14 – 16 and 32 - 34, Brown teaches a method for controlling access to a requestor to resources in a distributed computer system (fig. 2A), which further comprises the steps of performing an access check on two levels: a first level check on the type of the resource; and a second level check on the identifier; wherein the first-level check verifies the existence of at least one entry of the access control list that satisfies conditions for obtaining a requested right of entry, and if, the right of entry exists, the existence of a validity domain for said entry; wherein the second-level check verifies, if a requested permission for right of entry contains a resource identifier, the existence of at least one configured permission corresponding to the requested permission and the value of the additional information relative to the need to consult the validity (fig. 3B; col. 4, lines 40 – 65; col. 11, lines 3 – 31; col. 19, lines 52 - 67).

Regarding claims 17 - 21, Brown teaches a method for controlling access to a requestor to resources in a distributed computer system (fig. 2A), which further comprises the steps of grouping rights or resources into generic groups represented by special characters or keywords or other symbols (figs. 5A – 5B; col. 16, lines 55 – 67; col. 20, lines 53 - 63).

Regarding claim 22, Brown teaches a device for controlling access by a requestor to interrogated resources in a distributed computer system (fig. 8), comprising at least one management machine organized into one or more networks said machine

having at least one calling entity, for designating actions executed by the requestor (fig. 1; paragraph bridging col. 6, line 66 through col. 7, line 37), an application program interface for transmitting interrogations from the calling entity, an access control service for receiving said interrogations and controlling access of the requestors to the interrogated resources, storage means for storing roles, access control lists and validity domains and means for accessing the storage means (col. 3, lines 26 – 44; col. 7, lines 48 - 60).

Regarding claim 23, Brown teaches a device for controlling access by a requestor to interrogated resources in a distributed computer system (fig. 8), which further comprises means for defining conditions for obtaining a right to a resource, means for assigning to the requestor at least one role based on an access control list, and means for restricting the resources accessible for a given role to only part of the resources by means of a validity domain of the role (col. 1, lines 27 – 56; col. 2, lines 46 – 57; paragraph bridging col. 15, line 38 through col. 16, line 67; see abstract).

Regarding claims 24 and 25, Brown teaches a device for controlling access by a requestor to interrogated resources in a distributed computer system (fig. 8), wherein the means for storing stores an additional piece of information relative to the need to consult the validity domain of the role in the access control list (col. 4, lines 15 – 65).

Regarding claims 26 - 28, Brown teaches a device for controlling access by a requestor to interrogated resources in a distributed computer system (fig. 8), further comprising means for performing an access check on two levels: a first-level check on the type of the resource; and a second-level check on the identifier of the resource (2d);

wherein a first-level check verifies the existence of at least one entry of the access control list that satisfies conditions for obtaining a requested right of entry to a resource, and, if the entry exists, the existence of a validity domain for said entry; and wherein a second level check verifies if a requested right of entry to a resource contains a resource identifier, the existence of at least one configured permission corresponding to the requested right of entry and the value of additional information relative to the need to consult the validity domain (fig. 3B; col. 4, lines 40 – 65; col. 11, lines 3 – 31; col. 19, lines 52 - 67).

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Deinhart et al (US Patent Number 5,911,143) discloses a method and system for advanced role-based access control in distributed and centralized computer systems.

Contact Information


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Yves Dalencourt whose telephone number is (703) 308-8547. The examiner can normally be reached on M-TH 7:30AM - 6: 30PM.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on (703) 308-7562. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2157

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Yves Dalencourt


June 21, 2004


ARID ETIENNE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100